



CONTRACT NO. 93-334
FINAL REPORT
FEBRUARY 1995

Atmospheric Deposition to Agricultural Soil

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY



AIR RESOURCES BOARD
Research Division

Atmospheric Deposition to Agricultural Soil

Final Report

Contract No. 93-334

Prepared for:

California Air Resources Board
Research Division
2020 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Prepared by:

Randall Mutters
Principal Investigator

Statewide Air Pollution Research Center
University of California
Riverside, California 92521

February 1995

DISCLAIMER

The statements and conclusions in this report are those of the contractor and not necessarily those of the California Air Resources Board. The mention of commercial products, their source or use in connection with materials reported herein is not to be construed as either an actual or implied endorsement of such products.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank all those who contributed to this project. Among these are Brent Takemoto, California Air Resources Board; Stuart Pettygrove, University of California, Davis; Marty Martino, IMPACT Weather Database, University of California, Davis; and Justin Greene, Statewide Air Pollution Research Center. This final report was submitted in partial fulfillment of Research Division Contract Number 93-334 titled "Atmospheric Deposition to Agricultural Soil" by the University of California, Riverside, under the sponsorship of the California Air Resources Board. The report was completed as of February, 1995.

ABSTRACT

Atmospheric deposition of acidic air pollutants is widely recognized as an important environmental process. Most available data indicate that current levels of acidic deposition in California are below the levels required to adversely effect the yield of agricultural crops. However, excessive deposition of nutrient ions to soil may predispose plants to injury from other abiotic and biotic stresses. It was unknown whether current levels of acidic deposition exceed the growth requirements for any essential plant nutrients. Therefore, the objective of the study was to equate annual fluxes of dry and wet deposition to the nutritional requirements of major crops.

Aerometric data from a previously completed Air Resources Board (ARB) project (No. A132-149) were used to calculate atmospheric inputs and estimate regional-scale deposition flux across selected agricultural production areas in the state. Mean annual depositions of wet and dry acidic compounds from all monitoring stations were included in the data. Average fertilizer application rates were determined for 16 selected crops by agricultural region based on information from the University of California, Cooperative Extension Service. Typical amounts of nutrients taken up in the aboveground biomass on a seasonal basis were determined from published experimental results. Deposition fluxes were determined by using published species-specific deposition velocities for dry compounds and using precipitation data for wet compounds. For those agricultural counties where monitoring stations were present, acidic deposition data were used to calculate: (1) Total Annual Deposition (TAD) of nitrogen (N), sulfur (S), and calcium (Ca); (2) TAD as a percentage of the fertilizer applied; and (3) TAD as a percentage of nutrients taken up during the growing season. Dry deposition data were available from only two stations near agricultural areas, Sacramento and Bakersfield. In those counties, dry deposition was included in the seasonal totals.

The TAD of N ranged < 1 to 14.4 kg ha^{-1} on a county basis statewide. The highest deposition occurred in Kern county and the lowest in the coastal counties of Monterey and San Luis Obispo. Atmospheric deposition of N as a percentage of the fertilizer applied by growers ranged from 0.2% to 28% for lemon in San Luis Obispo county and for grape in Kern county, respectively. In contrast, TAD represented only 0.2% to 16% of seasonal N uptake by crops. Where dry deposition data were available, it represented approximately 8% to 15% of the TAD. The TAD of S ranged from 0.4 kg ha^{-1} in Contra Costa county to a high of 2.4 kg ha^{-1} in Kern county. This represented as much as 18% of the seasonal nutrient uptake of S by lettuce in Kern county. Sulfur is not routinely added as a fertilizer by California growers. Therefore, TAD as a percentage of applied fertilizer was not calculated. Similarly, California soil generally do not require amendment with Ca. The TAD of Ca represented $< 2\%$ of the seasonal nutrient uptake of the selected crops in all counties. Of those species typically measured in dry and wet deposition, only N at a few locations may represent a potential contributor to excessive nutrient loading to soil in California.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Disclaimer	2
Acknowledgments	2
Abstract	3
Table of Contents	4
List of Tables	5
Introduction	6
Statement of Problem	9
Project Objectives	9
Materials and Methods	9
Results and Discussion	16
Conclusions	21
Recommendations	21
References	32

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Seasonal Nitrogen and Sulfur Uptake of Important Non-nitrogen Fixing Crops in California	8
Table 2. Principal Chemical Species in Dry and Wet Deposition in California	9
Table 3. Monitoring Stations Located In or Near Agricultural Production Areas	10
Table 4. Mean Annual Wet Deposition (kg ha^{-1}) Measured at Monitoring Stations near Agricultural Areas	11
Table 5. Mean Annual Dry Deposition (kg ha^{-1}) Measured at Monitoring Stations Near Agricultural Areas	12
Table 6a. Monitoring Station Location, County, and Major Crops	12
Table 6b. Monitoring Station Location, County, and Major Crops	13
Table 7. Statewide Average Annual Fertilizer Application Rates (kg ha^{-1}) to Selected Crops in California	14
Table 8. Nutrient Uptake (kg ha^{-1}) by Various Crops During the Growing Season ..	15
Table 9. Total N from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content	17
Table 10. Total S from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content	22
Table 11. Total Ca from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content	27

INTRODUCTION

Atmospheric deposition of acidic air pollutants is widely recognized as an important environmental process. Depending on meteorological conditions, these pollutants are transported from a few to hundreds of kilometers from sources to receptors (Legge, 1990). Primary and secondary pollutants which emanate from natural and anthropogenic sources are deposited on the Earth's surface by precipitation (rain and fog) or through dry deposition. Although the adverse effects of ozone and other air pollutants (e.g., sulfur dioxide) on crop yields are well-established, the effects of existing levels of acidic deposition on agricultural productivity are less well understood. The effects of acidic deposition, potentially beneficial or adverse, are thought to occur along two primary pathways: (1) direct effects on crop vegetation which may adversely affect yield or quality; and (2) indirect effects through the interactions with soil properties, climatic conditions, pests, or other air pollutants (Shriner and Johnston, 1985).

Most available data support the hypothesis that current levels of acidic deposition in California are below that predicted to lead to direct effects on growth and yield reductions in the major agricultural crops. This conclusion is supported by the fact that: (1) rain events with pH values below 3.5 (level for foliar injury) are rare in California (ARB, 1992); (2) experimental plants, from which response functions are frequently derived, grown under controlled conditions are generally more susceptible to injury than field-grown plants; and (3) experimental results repeatedly demonstrate the ability of plants to recover from injury and/or compensate for initial growth reductions (Jacobson et al., 1985). The potential direct effects of acidic deposition on crop productivity in California were recently reviewed in the context of California Acid Deposition Monitoring Program (CADMP) data (Mutters, 1992).

The indirect effects via soil-related reactions are not well-documented. Acidic deposition (wet and dry) can have beneficial effects by supplying nitrogen (N), sulfur (S), and other nutrients to the foliage and soil. Conversely, the deposition of hydrogen ions (H^+) and acidifying compounds to the soil may cause long-term detrimental effects under certain conditions. In the latter case, much of what is known comes from the study of forest soil response to acidic deposition (Foster, 1989). One concern is N saturation, where the supply of atmospheric plus mineralized organic N exceeds the capacity of the ecosystem to assimilate it. Nitrogen saturation lends itself to acidification processes and to groundwater contamination via leached nitrates. Generally, the concern is that if acidification continues over long periods of time and the natural buffering capacity of the soil will eventually be fully titrated leading to a serious decline in soil pH. A decline in soil pH results in an increase in solubility of potentially toxic ions, such as aluminum and manganese (Stein and van Breemen, 1993). Soil high in aluminum ions may prove toxic to plants at a soil pH of 4.5 or less. Toxic levels of aluminum induce calcium (Ca) or iron toxicity symptoms, in addition to disrupting ATP-induced transmembrane transport functions (Liskens et al., 1989). Although a required nutrient, manganese has a narrow optimum pH range and is toxic if the range is exceeded (Tisdale and Nelson, 1975).

primary sources of acidic wet deposition. Once on the leaf surface, the pollutant may be taken up by the plant directly, chemically react with the surface of the leaf or be washed off by subsequent precipitation onto the soil (Marshall and Cadle, 1989). In the soil environment, acidic deposition may alter essential nutrient levels and influence soil pH. Soil may be exposed to frequent episodes of acidic fog or rain during the cool crop growing season. The pH of fog and rain in southern California may be as low as 2.0 and 3.0, respectively (Jacob et al., 1985, Hoffman, 1984). In contrast, the pH of precipitation in Tulare county during 1990 ranged from 4.8 to 7.0 (NADP, 1990).

Table 1. Seasonal Nitrogen and Sulfur Uptake* (kg ha ⁻¹) of Important Non-nitrogen Fixing Crops in California.**		
<i>Crop</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>S</i>
Cotton	180	28
Grape	125	20
Tomato	180	22
Orange	265	24
Corn	240	44
Lettuce	95	13
Rice	110	26
Sugar beet	255	50
Peach	95	17
Wheat	175	31

* Western Fertilizer Handbook, 1985 and Munson, 1982

** Total uptake in harvested portion of the crop. Reported uptake values may vary slightly depending on the source of the information

The properties of a particular soil are important to determine how it will chemically react to acidic deposition. Heavily weathered soil such as those found in the southeastern U.S. are initially acidic, often containing large amounts of exchangeable aluminum. The less weathered 'younger' soil formed from sedimentary material, typical of soil in the valleys of California, tend to be basic in reaction. They contain greater amounts of exchangeable cations. These exchangeable cations represent a pH buffer. Such basic soil with high exchangeable cation content are less likely to become acidified than highly weathered soil of the eastern U.S. Thus, the more relevant consequences of acidic deposition to soil in California may be the near time changes in soil fertility levels, rather than long-term acidification.

Among the plant nutrients present in both wet and dry acidic deposition in California, N species are taken up in the greatest quantities. Nitrogen is an essential component of chlorophyll, amino acids, and proteins. The amount of N (as nitrate (NO_3^-), ammonia (NH_3), and ammonium (NH_4^+)) from deposition varies temporally and spatially. The demand for N varies between crop and soil type. Approximate N demands for several crops important to California agriculture are listed in Table 1. To date no estimates exist of the nutritional demands supplied by acidic deposition processes in California.

Sulfur, a major component of both wet and dry deposition, is a minor macronutrient essential for plant growth. Sulfur requirements of selected crops are shown in Table 1. Two major sources of supplemental S to crop plants are atmospherically supplied S and incidental S as a component of N and phosphorus fertilizers. The increased use of high analysis, low-S fertilizers reduced the amount of incidental S applied and increased the occurrence of deficient soil in several areas (Adrienas, 1984). Estimates of deposited atmospheric S across the U.S. range from 2 to 12 kg ha^{-1} (NADP, 1990). Nonetheless, S-deficient soil is found in many states, particularly in the southeast (Martini and Mutters, 1985). Sulfur deficiencies, however, are uncommon in California (personal communication, Harry Andris, University of California, Cooperative Extension Service).

Dry deposition is the turbulent transport and sedimentation of gases and particles to the boundary layer close to the leaf or soil surface. The pollutant is then chemically or physically captured on the surface by processes of diffusion, convection, or inertial impaction (Legge and Krupa, 1986). Limited information is available on the consequences of acidic deposition to agricultural lands. In the agriculturally-rich San Joaquin Valley, dry deposition is an important means by which airborne acidic pollutants enter the agroecosystem during the summer growing season (ARB, 1988). The principal chemical species found in dry deposition in California are presented in Table 2. Only the N and S species form acidic compounds. The remaining elements are deposited unmodified to the soil surface. The bulk of the agricultural sales are generated from crop production during the summer months. Therefore, the potential consequences of dry deposition are of particular concern.

Wet deposition is the removal of suspended particles from the atmosphere by precipitation events. During the autumn and winter when cool season crops are grown, rain and fog are the

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

During the past decade several acidic deposition monitoring networks were established in the U.S. that provided data on a regional basis (Blanchard and Tonnessen, 1993). Several studies have addressed the regional deposition of acidic compounds in California (Lawson and Wendt, 1982; Liljestrand and Morgan, 1981; McColl et al., 1982). However, none provided data as extensive as that from the California Acid Deposition Monitoring Program (CADMP; Blanchard and Tonnessen, 1993). To date, the statewide wet and dry deposition data remain unevaluated in the context of soil nutrient requirements for agriculture. It is proposed to use the CADMP data to equate the annual flux of dry and wet deposition to the nutritional requirements of commercially-important crops in California.

Table 2. Principal Chemical Species in Dry and Wet Deposition in California *								
Mode of Deposition	----- Species -----							
Dry	NO ₂	NO ₃ ⁻	HNO ₃	NH ₃	SO ₂	SO ₄ ²⁻		
Wet	NO ₃ ⁻	NH ₄ ⁺	SO ₄ ²⁻	Ca ²⁺	Mg ²⁺	K ⁺	Na ⁺ **	Cl ⁻

* Blanchard and Tonnessen (1993), and ARB (1992)

** Not an essential plant nutrient

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

(1) Use deposition data from the Air Resources Board (ARB) sponsored CADMP to estimate the annual input of nutrient ions from wet and dry deposition to agricultural lands throughout the state.

(2) Evaluate the input in terms of nutritional requirements for major crops grown in the principal agricultural production zones of California.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Deposition Data: Processed and quality-assured data presented in an ARB sponsored report by Blanchard and Michaels (1994) were used for nutrient loading calculations. The authors used precipitation-chemistry data from the CADMP to estimate the flux of acidic species. Wet and dry deposition data gathered from stations located in or near agricultural production zones were used

Table 4. Mean Annual Wet Deposition (kg ha^{-1}) Measured at Monitoring Stations near Agricultural Areas				
<i>County</i>	<i>Site</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>Ca</i>
Orange	Anaheim	1.1	0.6	0.4
Kern	Bakersfield	1.3	0.6	0.4
Contra Costa	Bethel Island	1.3	0.4	0.4
San Diego	Escondido	1.0	0.8	0.8
Lake	Lakeport	1.2	0.6	0.4
Tulare	Lindcove	2.4	0.5	0.5
Siskiyou	Montague	0.6	0.2	0.3
Napa	Napa	1.5	1.1	0.5
San Luis Obispo	Nipomo	0.4	0.6	0.4
Sacramento	Sacramento	2.5	0.7	0.4
Monterey	Salinas	0.8	0.5	0.3
San Bernardino	San Bernardino	2.5	0.7	0.7

Seasonal dry deposition of an acidic specie was determined as the product of its ambient concentration and deposition velocity. Deposition velocity is analogous to a gravitational falling speed (Legge and Krupa, 1990; Allen et al., 1991). Using a simplified model, the flux of acidic compounds may be estimated from air concentrations as a simple product.

$$-F = C \times V_d$$

where: F = Flux away from the surface
 V_d = Deposition velocity for species

Deposition velocity (V_d) depends on surface characteristics and meteorological conditions that are site-specific. It is parameterized by the sum of the resistance's (r_i) to pollutant transfer ($r_a + r_b + r_s$), where r_a is the aerodynamic resistance, r_b is the boundary layer resistance, and r_s is the resistance associated with the chemical and biological reactivity of the particles with the surface (Allen et al., 1991; Voldner et al., 1986). Blanchard and Michaels (1994) used an expanded version of the model developed at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (Hicks et al., 1991), which included stomatal, cuticular, and soil resistances, as well as key meteorological statistics

for calculations presented in the current report (Table 3). Principal productions zones with monitoring stations were defined as the San Joaquin Valley, Sacramento Valley, Salinas Valley, and portions of Orange, San Bernardino, and Siskiyou counties.

Table 3. Monitoring Stations Located In or Near Agricultural Production Areas								
		--- Latitude ---			-- Longitude --			
<i>Site</i>	<i>Station No.</i>	<i>Deg</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Sec</i>	<i>Deg</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Sec</i>	<i>Elevation (m)</i>
Anaheim	30-194	33	49	53	117	55	6	45
Bakersfield	15-203	35	21	28	119	1	6	120
Bethel Island	07-442	38	0	38	121	38	29	0
Escondido	80-115	33	7	29	117	4	1	---
Lakeport	17-713	39	1	52	122	55	32	412
Lindcove	54-578	36	21	0	119	4	30	140
Montague	47-870	41	45	30	122	29	0	816
Napa	28-783	38	18	40	122	17	41	12
Nipomo	40-834	35	2	30	120	30	0	100
Sacramento	34-282	38	34	25	121	29	41	34
Salinas	27-544	36	41	50	121	37	57	13
San Bernardino	36-194	34	6	26	117	16	34	317

Aerometric wet and dry deposition data from a previously completed ARB sponsored project (Blanchard and Michaels, 1994; No. A132-149) were used to evaluate annual acidic deposition in terms of fertility requirements of major crops grown in selected agricultural production areas in the state. Procedures for determining quantities annually deposited and the associated uncertainties are described in detail in the report. Briefly, seasonal wet deposition was calculated based on observed precipitation chemistry and daily precipitation data gathered at appropriately located meteorological stations. The concentrations of key precipitation ions at various locations, together with precipitation depth, were used to compute ion deposition (kg ha^{-1} ; Table 4). Chemical composition of rain water from the CADMP database multiplied by the amount of rainfall on a monthly basis (National Weather Service; IMPACT Weather Database, Davis, CA) yielded volume-weighted wet deposition. Monthly volume-weighted values were summed to give annual wet deposition.

Table 6b. Monitoring Station Location, County, and Major Crops								
<i>Location</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Lemon</i>	<i>Lettuce</i>	<i>Orange</i>	<i>Peach</i>	<i>Rice</i>	<i>Tomato</i>	<i>Wheat</i>
Anaheim	Orange	X	X	X			X	
Bakersfield	Kern	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bethel Island	Contra Costa				X		X	X
Escondido	San Diego	X		X				
Lakeport	Lake							X
Lindcove	Tulare	X		X	X			X
Montague	Siskiyou							X
Napa	Napa							
Nipomo	San Luis Obispo	X	X	X				X
Sacramento	Sacramento		X			X	X	X
Salinas	Monterey		X				X	X
San Bernardino	San Bernardino	X	X	X				

Statewide average fertilizer use for crops of concern is presented in Table 7 (Rauschkolb and Mikkelsen, 1978; personal communication, Dr. S. Pettygrove, Department of Land, Air and Water Resources, University of California, Davis). California soil is generally not amended with Ca and magnesium (Mg), therefore, no application rates are presented. Organic Matter (OM) is frequently applied to fields in close proximity to animal husbandry operations. The amount of OM-applied plant nutrients is relatively small compared to the amount of chemically-formulated fertilizer applied. Consequently, nutrients derived from OM were not considered in the calculations. Furthermore, the statewide average values presented in Table 7 do not reflect local differences in agronomic practices or industry-wide changes adopted since the original survey. For example, semi-dwarf varieties of rice replaced taller statured predecessors throughout most of the rice production area by the mid-1980's. The shorter statured varieties are more heavily fertilized with N; sometimes at rates as high as 150 kg ha⁻¹ (personal communication, Dr. J. Hill, Agronomy Department, University of California, Davis). Estimates of nutrient loading in terms of fertilizer requirements presented herein, should be considered conservative.

which may modify flux. Annual dry flux of N and S at the two applicable sites were calculated assuming a cover of 15% grass, 15% tree, and 70% bare soil (Table 5). The V_d of HNO_3 , which accounted for 40 to 70% of the total N deposition (Blanchard and Michaels, 1994), is insensitive to surface type (Hicks et al., 1991).

Table 5. Mean Annual Dry Deposition (kg ha^{-1}) Measured at Monitoring Stations Near Agricultural Areas			
<i>County</i>	<i>Site</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>S</i>
Kern	Bakersfield	14.4	1.7
Sacramento	Sacramento	8.6	0.8

Nutritional Requirements for Major Crops: Major crops grown in each production area were chosen based on 1992 production statistics provided by the Agricultural Commissioner's Office in each county (Tables 6a, 6b).

Table 6a. Monitoring Station Location, County, and Major Crops							
<i>Location</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Alfalfa</i>	<i>Bean</i>	<i>Corn</i>	<i>Cotton</i>	<i>Grape</i>	<i>Grapefruit</i>
Anaheim	Orange		X				X
Bakersfield	Kern	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bethel Island	Contra Costa	X		X		X	
Escondido	San Diego					X	X
Lakeport	Lake	X				X	
Lindcove	Tulare	X	X	X	X	X	X
Montague	Siskiyou	X					
Napa	Napa					X	
Nipomo	San Luis Obispo	X				X	
Sacramento	Sacramento	X	X	X		X	
Salinas	Monterey	X	X			X	
San Bernardino	San Bernardino	X				X	X

Calculations: All nutrient quantities are presented on an elemental basis. For example, deposition of N-containing compounds (HNO_3 , NH_3 , NH_4^+ , NO_3^-) were converted to N content and summed. Sulfurous compounds were treated in a similar fashion. Atmospheric deposition of N was not considered in relation to legume crops, because N is infrequently applied, and if so, only in small quantities. Because Ca is not generally applied as a fertilizer in California, atmospheric deposition was analyzed only in the context of nutrient content in the aboveground biomass.

<i>Crop</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P₂O₅</i>	<i>K₂O</i>	<i>Ca</i>	<i>Mg</i>	<i>S</i>
Alfalfa	480	95	480	100	20	41
Bean (Snap)	175	40	200	100	20	17
Corn (Grain)	240	100	240	20	26	44
Cotton	180	65	125	150	53	28
Grape	125	45	195	---	---	20
Lettuce	95	30	200	---	---	13
Orange	265	55	330	---	---	24
Rice	110	60	150	20	9	26
Peach	95	40	120	---	---	17
Tomato	180	50	340	---	---	22
Wheat	175	70	200	20	9	31

Yearly deposition flux of the various nutrients were used in the following manner:

- (1) Total Annual Deposition (TAD) = Wet Deposition + Dry Deposition
- (2) Deposition as a Portion of Applied Fertilizer (AF) = $(\text{TAD} \div \text{AF}) * 100$
- (3) Deposition as a Portion of Crop Uptake = $(\text{TAD} \div \text{Nutrients in Aboveground Biomass}) * 100$
- (4) Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition = $(\text{Dry Deposition} \div \text{AF}) * 100$

The latter calculation was included to provide the reader information on the relative contribution of the contrasting pathways of deposition to soil nutrient loading. Obviously, the amount of wet deposition in relation to applied fertilizer can be obtained by difference between 2 and 4.

Table 7. Statewide Average Annual Fertilizer Application Rates (kg ha ⁻¹) to Selected Crops in California*				
<i>Crop</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>P₂O₅</i>	<i>K₂O</i>	<i>OM</i>
Alfalfa	20	76	19	3
Bean (Dry)	51	28	8	< 1
Corn	170	53	29	3
Cotton	109	42	100	7
Grape -- Raisin	58	19	21	4
Grape -- Table	56	19	25	6
Grape -- Wine/Juice	53	20	112	2
Grapefruit	154	43	29	2
Lemon	166	34	99	2
Lettuce	159	93	48	4
Orange	123	38	31	2
Peach	129	21	78	1
Rice	86	37	10	---
Tangerine	142	33	17	2
Tomato	142	80	55	2
Wheat -- Irrigated	104	33	3	3
Wheat -- Unirrigated	42	33	1	1

* Ca is not generally applied to soil in California

Seasonal Nutrient Uptake in the Aboveground Biomass of Selected Crops: Total amount of nutrients taken up by crops of interest during the growing season are presented in Table 8 (Kardos, et al., 1977; Eaton and Ergle, 1957; Western Fertilizer Handbook, 1985). Uptake (kg ha⁻¹) was determined based on typical planting densities used on California farms. The bulk nutrient uptake in excess of applied quantities are supplied by elemental fixation by the plant, and mineralization, decomposition, and weathering processes in soil.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Annual wet deposition of N ranged from 0.8 to 2.5 kg ha⁻¹ in Monterey and Sacramento counties, respectively (Table 9). In contrast for the two counties considered, dry deposition added 8.6 kg N ha⁻¹ to the soil in Sacramento county and 14.4 kg N ha⁻¹ in Kern county. The TAD was substantially less in counties where dry deposition data were unavailable. The large difference may be attributable to the seasonal anthropomorphic activities and factors influencing airborne particulate matter. Wet deposition occurs predominantly from November to April in much of state. Moist conditions generally minimize airborne particulate matter. The amount of PM₁₀ associated acid particles would thus be less during the winter.

In rural areas, agricultural activity is at a low during the wet season. Dry deposition occurs in the summer growing season, when agricultural activity is at a peak. Volatilization of N fertilizers may significantly contribute to atmospheric concentrations of NH₃ and NH₄⁺ in localized areas. Depending on wind conditions and associated transport patterns, dry deposition could conceivably represent a recycling of N which originated from local area soil. Under such circumstances, estimates of N loading in relation to agricultural operations may be an overestimate, because the dry deposition originated initially from the fertilizer application.

The previous point aside, acid deposition represented from 0.2% to about 28% of the N typically applied as fertilizer to lemon in San Luis Obispo and to grape in Kern counties, respectively. This exemplifies a reoccurring pattern throughout the data set where inland areas experience high levels of deposition, while levels remain low in the coastal counties. The TAD was proportional to only 0.4% of N uptake by tomato in Monterey county. However in Kern county, N deposition was equivalent to over 14% of N taken up by lettuce.

Sulfur is seldom applied as a fertilizer in California. Consequently, acidic deposition was considered only in the context of crop uptake (Table 10). Similar to N, annual dry deposition of S (1.7 kg S ha⁻¹) was considerably higher than wet deposition (0.6 kg S ha⁻¹). The TAD (2.4 kg S ha⁻¹) corresponded to as little as 0.7% of wheat uptake in Siskiyou county and as much as 18% of S uptake by lettuce in Kern county.

The TAD of Ca was substantially less than either N or S (Table 11). The TAD ranged from 0.3 to 0.7 kg Ca ha⁻¹ in Monterey and San Bernardino counties, respectively. Atmospheric deposition of Ca represented less than 3% of plant uptake for all crops in all counties. In terms of plant nutrition or as a potential soil pH buffer, Ca appeared to be inconsequential. No environmental consequences would be expected.

Table 9. Total N from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content									
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	N in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition
----- kg ha ⁻¹ -----				----- % -----					
Contra Costa	Corn	170	240	1.3	---	1.3	0.8	0.6	---
Contra Costa	Grape	56	125	1.3	---	1.3	2.4	1.1	---
Contra Costa	Peach	129	95	1.3	---	1.3	1.0	1.4	---
Contra Costa	Tomato	142	180	1.3	---	1.3	0.9	0.7	---
Contra Costa	Wheat	104	175	1.3	---	1.3	1.3	0.8	---
Kern	Corn	170	240	1.3	14.4	15.7	9.2	6.5	8.5
Kern	Cotton	109	180	1.3	14.4	15.7	14.3	8.7	13.2
Kern	Grapefruit	154	---	1.3	14.4	15.7	10.2	***	9.3
Kern	Grape	56	125	1.3	14.4	15.7	27.9	12.5	25.7
Kern	Lemon	166	---	1.3	14.4	15.7	9.4	***	8.7
Kern	Lettuce	159	95	1.3	14.4	15.7	9.9	16.5	9.0
Kern	Orange	123	265	1.3	14.4	15.7	12.7	5.9	11.7
Kern	Peach	129	95	1.3	14.4	15.7	12.1	16.5	11.1
Kern	Rice	86	110	1.3	14.4	15.7	18.2	14.2	16.7
Kern	Tomato	142	180	1.3	14.4	15.7	11.0	8.7	10.1
Kern	Wheat	104	175	1.3	14.4	15.7	15.1	8.9	13.8
Lake	Grape	56	125	1.2	---	1.2	2.2	0.9	---
Lake	Wheat	104	175	1.2	---	1.2	1.2	0.7	---

Table 9 (Continued). Total N from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content									
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	N in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition
				kg ha ⁻¹		%			
San Bernardino	Lemon	166	---	2.5	---	2.5	1.5	***	---
San Bernardino	Lettuce	159	95	2.5	---	2.5	1.5	2.6	---
San Bernardino	Orange	123	265	2.5	---	2.5	2.0	0.9	---
San Diego	Grapefruit	154	---	1.0	---	1.0	0.7	**	---
San Diego	Grape	56	125	1.0	---	1.0	1.8	0.8	---
San Diego	Lemon	166	---	1.0	---	1.0	0.6	***	---
San Diego	Orange	123	265	1.0	---	1.0	0.8	0.4	---
San Luis Obispo	Grape	56	125	0.4	---	0.4	0.7	0.3	---
San Luis Obispo	Lemon	166	---	0.4	---	0.4	0.2	***	---
San Luis Obispo	Lettuce	159	95	0.4	---	0.4	0.2	0.4	---
San Luis Obispo	Orange	123	265	0.4	---	0.4	0.3	0.1	---
San Luis Obispo	Wheat	104	175	0.4	---	0.4	0.4	0.2	---
Siskiyou	Wheat	104	175	0.6	---	0.6	0.6	0.3	---
Tulare	Corn	170	240	2.4	---	2.4	1.4	1.0	---
Tulare	Cotton	109	180	2.4	---	2.4	2.2	1.3	---
Tulare	Grapefruit	154	---	2.4	---	2.4	1.6	***	---
Tulare	Grape	56	125	2.4	---	2.4	4.3	1.9	---
Tulare	Lemon	166	---	2.4	---	2.4	1.4	***	---

Table 9 (Continued). Total N from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content									
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	N in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition
----- kg ha ⁻¹ -----					----- % -----				
Monterey	Grape	56	125	0.8	---	0.8	1.4	0.7	---
Monterey	Lettuce	159	95	0.8	---	0.8	0.5	0.8	---
Monterey	Tomato	142	180	0.8	---	0.8	0.5	0.4	---
Monterey	Wheat	104	175	0.8	---	0.8	0.8	0.4	---
Napa	Grape	56	125	1.5	---	1.5	2.7	1.2	---
Orange	Grapefruit	154	---	1.1	---	1.1	0.7	**	---
Orange	Lemon	166	---	1.1	---	1.1	0.7	**	---
Orange	Lettuce	159	95	1.1	---	1.1	0.7	1.2	---
Orange	Orange	123	265	1.1	---	1.1	0.9	0.4	---
Orange	Tomato	142	180	1.1	---	1.1	0.8	0.6	---
Sacramento	Corn	170	240	2.5	8.6	11.1	6.5	4.6	5.0
Sacramento	Grape	56	125	2.5	8.6	11.1	19.8	8.8	15.3
Sacramento	Lettuce	159	95	2.5	8.6	11.1	6.9	11.6	5.4
Sacramento	Rice	86	110	2.5	8.6	11.1	12.9	10.1	9.9
Sacramento	Tomato	142	180	2.5	8.6	11.1	7.8	6.1	6.0
Sacramento	Wheat	104	175	2.5	8.6	11.1	10.6	6.3	8.3
San Bernardino	Grapefruit	154	---	2.5	---	2.5	1.6	***	---
San Bernardino	Grape	56	125	2.5	---	2.5	4.4	1.9	---

CONCLUSIONS

Atmospheric N appeared to contribute as much as 28% of the traditionally applied fertilizer in Kern county. The complexities of N cycling, however, between the soil and atmosphere in agricultural areas are not well-understood. Estimated N flux may in fact represent the redeposition of volatilized N originating from applied fertilizers. Therefore, recommendations to reduce current fertilizer application rates are premature until the localized N cycling is better quantified. Regardless, based upon the current analyses, only N among nutrient elements present in acidic deposition may pose a potential for excessive nutrient loading to the agricultural soil of California.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The soil fertility-related statistics derived from this project are complementary to the statewide digital soil database archived at the Statewide Air Pollution Research Center (SAPRC). The continued development of a Geographic Information System (GIS) soil data management system strengthens the ability of administrators and researchers to access, critically analyze, and visualize soil related information as it relates to air quality.

Table 10. Total S from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content									
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	S in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition
				kg ha ⁻¹			%		
Contra Costa	Alfalfa	0	41	0.4	---	0.4	**	1.0	---
Contra Costa	Corn	0	44	0.4	---	0.4	**	0.9	---
Contra Costa	Grape	0	20	0.4	---	0.4	**	2.1	---
Contra Costa	Peach	0	17	0.4	---	0.4	**	2.4	---
Contra Costa	Tomato	0	22	0.4	---	0.4	**	1.9	---
Contra Costa	Wheat	0	31	0.4	---	0.4	**	1.3	---
Kern	Alfalfa	0	41	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	5.8	***
Kern	Bean	0	17	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	13.9	***
Kern	Corn	0	44	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	5.4	***
Kern	Cotton	0	28	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	8.5	***
Kern	Grapefruit	0	---	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	**	***
Kern	Grape	0	20	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	11.9	***
Kern	Lemon	0	---	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	**	***
Kern	Lettuce	0	13	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	18.2	***
Kern	Orange	0	24	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	9.9	***
Kern	Peach	0	17	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	13.9	***
Kern	Rice	0	26	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	9.1	***

Table 10 (Continued). Total S from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content									
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	S in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition
----- kg ha ⁻¹ -----				----- % -----					
Kern	Tomato	0	22	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	10.8	***
Kern	Wheat	0	31	0.7	1.7	2.4	**	7.6	***
Lake	Alfalfa	0	41	0.6	---	0.6	**	1.4	---
Lake	Grape	0	20	0.6	---	0.6	**	2.8	---
Lake	Wheat	0	31	0.6	---	0.6	**	1.8	---
Monterey	Alfalfa	0	41	0.5	---	0.5	**	1.1	---
Monterey	Bean	0	17	0.5	---	0.5	**	2.6	---
Monterey	Grape	0	20	0.5	---	0.5	**	2.3	---
Monterey	Lettuce	0	13	0.5	---	0.5	**	3.5	---
Monterey	Tomato	0	22	0.5	---	0.5	**	2.1	---
Monterey	Wheat	0	31	0.5	---	0.5	**	1.5	---
Napa	Grape	0	20	1.1	---	1.1	**	5.7	---
Orange	Bean	0	17	0.6	---	0.6	**	3.6	---
Orange	Grapefruit	0	---	0.6	---	0.6	**	**	---
Orange	Lemon	0	---	0.6	---	0.6	**	**	---
Orange	Lettuce	0	13	0.6	---	0.6	**	4.8	---
Orange	Orange	0	24	0.6	---	0.6	**	2.6	---
Orange	Tomato	0	22	0.6	---	0.6	**	2.8	---

Table 10 (Continued). Total S from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content									
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	S in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition
				kg ha ⁻¹			%		
Sacramento	Alfalfa	0	41	0.7	0.8	1.5	**	3.7	***
Sacramento	Bean	0	17	0.7	0.8	1.5	**	8.9	***
Sacramento	Corn	0	44	0.7	0.8	1.5	**	3.5	***
Sacramento	Grape	0	20	0.7	0.8	1.5	**	7.6	***
Sacramento	Lettuce	0	13	0.7	0.8	1.5	**	11.7	***
Sacramento	Rice	0	26	0.7	0.8	1.5	**	5.8	***
Sacramento	Tomato	0	22	0.7	0.8	1.5	**	6.9	***
Sacramento	Wheat	0	31	0.7	0.8	1.5	**	4.9	***
San Bernardino	Alfalfa	0	41	0.7	---	0.7	**	1.7	---
San Bernardino	Grapefruit	0	---	0.7	---	0.7	**	**	---
San Bernardino	Grape	0	20	0.7	---	0.7	**	3.5	---
San Bernardino	Lemon	0	---	0.7	---	0.7	**	**	---
San Bernardino	Lettuce	0	13	0.7	---	0.7	**	5.3	---
San Bernardino	Orange	0	24	0.7	---	0.7	**	2.9	---
San Diego	Grapefruit	0	---	0.8	---	0.8	**	**	---
San Diego	Grape	0	20	0.8	---	0.8	**	3.8	---
San Diego	Lemon	0	---	0.8	---	0.8	**	**	---

Table 10 (Continued). Total S from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content									
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	S in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition
				kg ha ⁻¹			%		
San Diego	Orange	0	24	0.8	---	0.8	**	3.2	---
San Luis Obispo	Alfalfa	0	41	0.6	---	0.6	**	1.4	---
San Luis Obispo	Grape	0	20	0.6	---	0.6	**	2.9	---
San Luis Obispo	Lemon	0	---	0.6	---	0.6	**	***	---
San Luis Obispo	Lettuce	0	13	0.6	---	0.6	**	4.4	---
San Luis Obispo	Orange	0	24	0.6	---	0.6	**	2.4	---
San Luis Obispo	Wheat	0	31	0.6	---	0.6	**	1.8	---
Siskiyou	Alfalfa	0	41	0.2	---	0.2	**	0.6	---
Siskiyou	Wheat	0	31	0.2	---	0.2	**	0.7	---
Tulare	Alfalfa	0	41	0.5	---	0.5	**	1.3	---
Tulare	Bean	0	17	0.5	---	0.5	**	3.1	---
Tulare	Corn	0	44	0.5	---	0.5	**	1.2	---
Tulare	Cotton	0	28	0.5	---	0.5	**	1.9	---
Tulare	Grapefruit	0	---	0.5	---	0.5	**	***	---
Tulare	Grape	0	20	0.5	---	0.5	**	2.7	---
Tulare	Lemon	0	---	0.5	---	0.5	**	***	---

Table 10 (Continued). Total S from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content									
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	S in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition
				kg ha ⁻¹				%	
Tulare	Orange	0	24	0.5	---	0.5	**	2.2	---
Tulare	Peach	0	17	0.5	---	0.5	**	3.1	---
Tulare	Wheat	0	31	0.5	---	0.5	**	1.7	---

* In California, S is only applied as a trace contaminant in other fertilizers

** S in the harvested portion of the crop (Western Fertilizer Handbook, 1985)

*** Insufficient data

--- Not applicable

Table 11. Total Ca from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content										
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	Ca in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition	
				kg ha ⁻¹				%		
Contra Costa	Alfalfa	0	100	0.4	---	0.4	**	0.4	---	---
Contra Costa	Corn	0	20	0.4	---	0.4	**	1.8	---	---
Contra Costa	Grape	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---	---
Contra Costa	Peach	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---	---
Contra Costa	Tomato	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---	---
Contra Costa	Wheat	0	20	0.4	---	0.4	**	1.8	---	---
Kern	Alfalfa	0	100	0.4	---	0.4	**	0.4	---	---
Kern	Bean	0	100	0.4	---	0.4	**	0.4	---	---
Kern	Corn	0	20	0.4	---	0.4	**	2.1	---	---
Kern	Cotton	0	150	0.4	---	0.4	**	0.3	---	---
Kern	Grapefruit	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---	---
Kern	Grape	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---	---
Kern	Lemon	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---	---
Kern	Lettuce	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---	---
Kern	Orange	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---	---
Kern	Peach	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---	---
Kern	Rice	0	20	0.4	---	0.4	**	2.1	---	---
Kern	Tomato	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---	---

Table 11 (Continued). Total Ca from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content									
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	Ca in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition
----- kg ha ⁻¹ -----				----- % -----					
Contra Costa	Alfalfa	0	100	0.4	---	0.4	**	0.4	---
Lake	Alfalfa	0	100	0.4	---	0.4	**	0.4	---
Lake	Grape	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
Lake	Wheat	0	20	0.4	---	0.4	**	2.1	---
Monterey	Alfalfa	0	100	0.3	---	0.3	**	0.3	---
Monterey	Bean	0	100	0.3	---	0.3	**	0.3	---
Monterey	Grape	0	---	0.3	---	0.3	**	***	---
Monterey	Lettuce	0	---	0.3	---	0.3	**	***	---
Monterey	Tomato	0	---	0.3	---	0.3	**	***	---
Monterey	Wheat	0	20	0.3	---	0.3	**	1.7	---
Napa	Grape	0	---	0.5	---	0.5	**	***	---
Orange	Bean	0	100	0.4	---	0.4	**	0.4	---
Orange	Grapefruit	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
Orange	Lemon	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
Orange	Lettuce	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
Orange	Orange	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
Orange	Tomato	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
Sacramento	Alfalfa	0	100	0.4	---	0.4	**	0.4	---

Table 11 (Continued). Total Ca from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content									
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	Ca in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition
				kg ha ⁻¹		%			
Sacramento	Bean	0	100	0.4	---	0.4	**	0.4	---
Sacramento	Corn	0	20	0.4	---	0.4	**	2.1	---
Sacramento	Grape	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
Sacramento	Lettuce	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
Sacramento	Rice	0	20	0.4	---	0.4	**	2.1	---
Sacramento	Tomato	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
Sacramento	Wheat	0	20	0.4	---	0.4	**	2.1	---
San Bernardino	Alfalfa	0	100	0.7	---	0.7	**	0.7	---
San Bernardino	Grapefruit	0	---	0.7	---	0.7	**	***	---
San Bernardino	Grape	0	---	0.7	---	0.7	**	***	---
San Bernardino	Lemon	0	---	0.7	---	0.7	**	***	---
San Bernardino	Lettuce	0	---	0.7	---	0.7	**	***	---
San Bernardino	Orange	0	---	0.7	---	0.7	**	***	---
San Diego	Grapefruit	0	---	0.8	---	0.8	**	***	---
San Diego	Grape	0	---	0.8	---	0.8	**	***	---
San Diego	Lemon	0	---	0.8	---	0.8	**	***	---
San Diego	Orange	0	---	0.8	---	0.8	**	***	---
San Luis Obispo	Alfalfa	0	100	0.4	---	0.4	**	0.4	---

Table 11 (Continued). Total Ca from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content									
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	Ca in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition
				kg ha ⁻¹			----- % -----		
San Luis Obispo	Grape	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
San Luis Obispo	Lemon	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
San Luis Obispo	Lettuce	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
San Luis Obispo	Orange	0	---	0.4	---	0.4	**	***	---
San Luis Obispo	Wheat	0	20	0.4	---	0.4	**	2.1	---
Siskiyou	Alfalfa	0	100	0.3	---	0.3	**	0.3	---
Siskiyou	Wheat	0	20	0.3	---	0.3	**	1.3	---
Tulare	Alfalfa	0	100	0.5	---	0.5	**	0.5	---
Tulare	Bean	0	100	0.5	---	0.5	**	0.5	---
Tulare	Corn	0	20	0.5	---	0.5	**	2.5	---
Tulare	Cotton	0	150	0.5	---	0.5	**	0.3	---
Tulare	Grapefruit	0	---	0.5	---	0.5	**	***	---
Tulare	Grape	0	---	0.5	---	0.5	**	***	---
Tulare	Lemon	0	---	0.5	---	0.5	**	***	---
Tulare	Orange	0	---	0.5	---	0.5	**	***	---
Tulare	Peach	0	---	0.5	---	0.5	**	***	---

Table 11 (Continued). Total Ca from Atmospheric Deposition in Relation to Common Fertilization Practices and Plant Nutrient Content									
County	Crop	Added as Fertilizer*	Ca in Aboveground Biomass**	Annual Wet Deposition	Annual Dry Deposition	Total Deposition	Portion of Fertilizer Applied	Portion of Uptake	Portion of Applied Fertilizer Supplied by Dry Deposition
----- kg ha ⁻¹ ----- % -----									
Tulare	Wheat	0	20	0.5	---	0.5	**	2.5	---

* Ca is not applied to soil in California

** Ca in the harvested portion of the crop (Western Fertilizer Handbook, 1985)

*** Insufficient data

--- Not applicable

REFERENCES

- Adrienas, P. 1984. Inputs: Outlook and situation. Economic Research Service, USDA, IOS-3, p 25.
- Allen, AG, RM Harrison, and KW Nicholson. 1991. Dry deposition of fine aerosol to a short grass surface. *Atmos. Environ.* 25A:2671-2676.
- Air Resources Board (ARB). 1988. *The Health and Welfare Effects of Acidic Deposition in California: Technical Assessment*. Research Division, Sacramento, CA.
- Air Resources Board (ARB). 1992. *The Atmospheric Acidity Protection Program: Annual Report to the Governor and Legislature, 1991*. Research Division, Sacramento, CA.
- Blanchard, CL, and KA Tonnessen. 1993. Precipitation chemistry measurements from the California Acid Deposition Monitoring Program, 1985-1990. *Atmos. Environ.* 27A:1755-1763.
- Blanchard, CL, and H Michaels. 1994. Regional Estimates of Acid Deposition Fluxes in California. Final report, California Air Resources Board, Contract No. A132-149.
- Eaton, FM, and DR Ergle. 1957. Mineral nutrition of the cotton plant. *Plant Physiol.* 32(3):169-175.
- Foster, NW. 1989. Acidic deposition: What is fact, what is speculation, what is needed? *Water Air Soil Pollut.* 48:299-306.
- Hicks, BB, RP Hosker, TP Meyers, and JD Womack. 1991. Dry deposition inferential measurement techniques. I. Design and tests of a prototype meteorological and chemical system for determining dry deposition. *Atmos. Environ.* 25A(10): 2345-2359.
- Hoffman, MR. 1984. Comment on acid fog. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 18:51-64.
- Jacob, DJ, JM Waldman, JW Munger, and MR Hoffman. 1985. Chemical composition of fogwater collected along the California coast. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 19:730-736.
- Jacobson, JS, J Troiano, and L Heller. 1985. Stage of development response and recovery of radish plants from episodic exposure to simulated acid rain. *J. Exp. Bot.* 36: 159-167.

- Kardos, I.T, CE Scarsbrook, and VV Volk. 1977. *Recycling Elements in Wastes Through Plant-Soil Systems*. Soil for Management of Organic Waste and Waste Waters. Soil Science Society of America, Madison, WI.
- Lawson, DR, and JG Wendt. 1982. Acid deposition in California. *Soc. Auto. Eng., Technical Paper Series* No. 821246.
- Legge, AH. 1990. Sulfur and nitrogen in the atmosphere. IN: Legge, AH, and SV Krupa. (eds) 1990. *Acidic Deposition: Sulfur and Nitrogen Oxides*. Lewis Publishers, Chelsea.
- Legge, AH, and SV Krupa. (eds) 1986. *Air Pollutants and Their Effects on the Terrestrial Ecosystem*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Legge, AH, and SV Krupa. (eds) 1990. *Acidic Deposition: Sulphur and Nitrogen Oxides*. Lewis Publishers, Chelsea.
- Liljestrand, HG, and JJ Morgan. 1981. Spatial variations of acid precipitation in southern California. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 15: 33-339.
- Liskens, HF, FM Derks, and GF Schonenberg. 1989. The influence of artificial acid rain on the physiology and morphology of *Phaseolus vulgaris*, *Vicia faba*, and *Spinacia oleracea* after separate spraying of the shoots and soil. *Angew. Bot.* 63: 67-80.
- Marshall, JD, and SH Cadle. 1989. Evidence for transcuticular uptake of HNO_3 vapor by foliage of eastern white pine (*Pinus strobus* L.). *Environ. Pollut.* 60: 15-28.
- Martini, JA, and RG Mutters. 1985. Effect of liming and fertilization on sulfur availability, mobility, and uptake in cultivated soil of South Carolina. *Soil Sci.* 138: 403-410.
- McColl, JG, LK Monette, and DS Bush. 1982. Chemical characteristics of wet and dry atmospheric fallout in northern California. *J. Environ. Qual.* 11: 585-590.
- Munson, RD. 1982. Soil fertility, fertilizers, and plant nutrition. IN: Kilmer, KJ. (ed) 1982. *Handbook of Soil and Climate in Agriculture*. CRC Press, Boca Raton. p. 269-293.
- Mutters, RG. 1992. Effects of acidic deposition on crops in the San Joaquin Valley. IN: Air Resources Board. 1992. *The Atmospheric Acidity Protection Program: Annual Report to the Governor and Legislature, 1991*. Research Division, Sacramento, CA.

- National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP). 1990. *Annual Data Summary*.
- Rauschkolb RS, and DS Mikkelsen. 1978. *Fertilizer Use in California*. USDA Cooperative Extension Bulletin No. 1887.
- Shriner, DS , and JW Johnston. 1985. *Acid Deposition: Effects on Agricultural Crops*. Final Report, No. PR 1908-2, Electric Power Research Institute. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN.
- Stein, A, and N van Breeman. 1993. Time series analysis of changes in the soil solution: Evidence for approach to nitrogen saturation in Dutch soil. *Agric. Ecosys. Environ.* 47:147-158.
- Tisdale, SL, and WL Nelson. 1975. *Soil Fertility and Fertilizers*. pp 317.
- Voldner, EC, LA Barrie, and A Sirios. 1986. A literature review of dry deposition of oxides sulphur and nitrogen with emphasis on long-range transport modelling in North America. *Atmos. Environ.* 20: 2101-2123.
- Western Fertilizer Handbook. 1985. Interstate Printers and Publishers, Danville, IL.

